REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-11, 13-17, 19, 20, 22-27 and 29-36 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Alleged Obviousness, Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-17, 19-20, 22-27 and 29-36

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-17, 19-20, 22-27 and 29-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paltenghe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,729 B1) in view of Doeberl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,237,033 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

> As to claims 1, 9, 14-17, 25 and 30-36, the Office Action states:
>
> As per claims 1 and 17, Paltenghe discloses a method in a data processing system for managing cookies (see col. 2, lines 20-22), "receiving a request to accept a cookie" as configured browser on the user's PC 4 then asks the user 6 whether it is okay to accept the cookie, (see col. 7, lines 7-9);
>
> "accepting the cookie" as the user accepts the cookie, (see col. 7, line 40); and
>
> "storing the cookie only in a temporary data store within the data processing system" as the system for an embodiment makes use of application software such as an electronic or virtual wallet and the cookie jar resides in the electronic or virtual wallet 'an electronic wallet is an embodiment of software acting as a container', (see col. 6, lines 16-25). Further, in column 8, lines 24-31, Paltenghe discloses the browser forward the cookie data to the virtual or electronic wallet 12, which stores the cookie data in the cookie jar 10 resident in the electronic wallet, at S28 when the user 6 returns to the website, the web server 2 requests that its cookie be returned at S29. Paltenghe does not explicitly discloses "presenting a list of unsaved cookies"; and "selectively saving cookies within the list of unsaved cookies in response to a user input as to which of the cookies are to be saved." However, Doeberl discloses the user activates the cookie editor 13 in the file mode, in which the cookie editor then presents to the user an interpreted display of each cookie in the cookie file 10, (col. 5, lines 25-32); and both the cookie blocking browsers and cookie file managers indicate to a user the identity of the website responsible for each cookie intended to be set or stored in the cookie file, (see col. 2, lines 18-20). It would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined teachings of Paltenghe and Doeberl with list of cookies. Such modification would allow the teachings of Paltenghe and Doeberl with list of cookies. Such modification would allow the teachings of Paltenghe and Doeberl to provide information about a user to a website operated by the internet content provider, (see col. 1, lines 9-10).

Office Action dated November 24, 2003, pages 3-4.

Independent claim 1, which is representative of independent claims 9, 15-17, 25 and 31-33, recites:

> 1. A method in a data processing system for managing cookies, the method comprising:
> receiving a request to accept a cookie;
> accepting the cookie;
> storing the cookie only in a temporary data store within the data processing system;
> presenting a list of unsaved cookies; and
> selectively saving a portion of the unsaved cookies, within the list of unsaved cookies, to a permanent data storage in response to a user input as to which of the unsaved cookies in the list of unsaved cookies are to be saved. (emphasis added)

Paltenghe teaches a system to manage the flow and content of information in cookies in order to protect the privacy of the information contained in storage areas of users' PCs (col. 3, lines 55-58). Paltenghe controls the transmission of stored data to an Internet website server utilizing a "cookie jar" in an electronic or virtual wallet. With the system of Paltenghe, when a server requests permission to load a cookie onto a user's hard drive (step S12 of Figure 3), the user is presented with the option to either accept the cookie or not accept the cookie. If the user accepts the cookie (step S15), the cookie is stored on the user's hard drive. If the user does not accept the cookie (step S13), the web page is provided on the user's PC, but no cookie is stored.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Paltenghe does not teach presenting a list of unsaved cookies and selectively saving cookies within the list of unsaved cookies in response to a user input as to which of the cookies are to be saved. However, Applicants do not agree with the Examiner that Doeberl teaches these features.

Doeberl is directed to a system for enabling a user of a computer to manage so-called Internet cookies on a computer attached to the Internet and using a browser to access websites through the World Wide Web. Such cookies have a type and a value. The managing includes displaying to a user an interpretation of cookies that have been set on the user's computer; the interpretation is made by an interpreter referring to a local cookie dictionary, on the user's computer, having entries corresponding to different types of cookies. The managing also includes changing the values set by the websites, and fabricating cookies of types not necessarily used by a website in order to express to the website preferences a user wants the website to know (Abstract).

However, Doeberl does not teach presenting a list of unsaved cookies or selectively saving a portion of the unsaved cookies, within the list of unsaved cookies, to a permanent storage in response to a user input as to which of the cookies are to be saved. The Office Action alleges that Doeberl teaches these features at column 5, lines 25-32 and column 2, lines 18-20, which read as follows:

> The present invention is used by a user in two ways: for managing cookies in the user's cookies file **10**, or for managing cookies in RAM. In the first way, while the user is either connected to the Internet or offline, the user activates the cookie editor **13** in file mode (as compared with RAM mode, as explained below). The cookie editor then presents to the user an interpreted display of each cookie in the cookie file **10**, the interpretation provided through the cookie interpreter **15**, using the local cookie dictionary **17** stored on the user's computer.

(Column 5, lines 25-32, Doeberl)

> Both the cookie-blocking browsers and cookie file managers indicate to a user the identity of the website responsible for each cookie intended to be set or stored in the cookie file.

(Column 2, lines 18-20, Doeberl)

In the above sections, Doeberl only teaches presenting an interpretation of a cookie in a cookie file or in random access memory (RAM) by using a local cookie dictionary. However, Doeberl does not teach presenting a list of unsaved cookies or selectively saving a cookie within the list of unsaved cookies to a permanent store, as recited in claim 1. Doeberl teaches managing cookies in a file mode. The cookies in the cookie file are saved cookies. In addition, the cookie

file is stored in a permanent storage, which is the user's computer storage, e.g. a hard drive. Therefore, Doeberl teaches cookies that are saved to a permanent storage, not a list of unsaved cookies, as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Doeberl teaches a second mode of operation that comprises managing cookies in a RAM mode, at column 6, line 47 to column 7, line 5, which reads as follows:

> In the second way of using the present invention, the user manages a cookie in RAM. In this case, when a website sets a cookie in RAM, the browser notifies the cookie interpreter and passes to it the RAM address of the cookie. The cookie interpreter executes the cookie editor; the editor then automatically executes in RAM mode (compared to file mode, noted above), i.e., without any involvement by the user. Then the cookie editor attempts to interpret the cookie based on the local cookie dictionary. If it cannot, it directs the browser **11** to access the site-specific cookie dictionary **21**, and then searches that dictionary for an interpretation of the cookie. If it locates the interpretation for the cookie, it provides the interpretation to the user. The user can then inspect the cookie, alter it, or block it.
>
> Another way of managing cookies in RAM is for a user to fabricate a cookie while accessing a website using the browser **11**. The user would do this to convey to the website preferences the user may want the website to know. In this scenario, the user executes the cookie editor **13** in RAM mode, as compared with file mode used to manage cookies in the cookies file, and then fabricates a cookie in the same way as when the cookies editor is executed in offline mode. When the user is done fabricating the cookie, the cookie editor sets the cookie in RAM without any further involvement by the user.
> (emphasis added)

In the above section, Doeberl teaches that when a website sets a cookie in RAM, the browser notifies the cookie interpreter and passes the cookie interpreter the RAM address of the cookie. The cookie interpreter then executes the cookie editor in RAM mode and interprets the cookie. Doeberl teaches a technique that is similar to Paltenghe, where each cookie is interpreted individually in RAM when it is placed there. The user is given the opportunity to block the cookie via the editor, but this is done each time a cookie is set in RAM. This is contrary to the present invention, where a cookie is accepted in a temporary storage during a session, a list of unsaved cookies are accumulated, and subsequently a list of

unsaved cookies is presented to the user, who may then select from the list those cookies that are to be saved to a permanent storage. Rather than presenting a list of unsaved cookies, both Doeberl and Paltenghe require the user to select whether to store or block a cookie as each cookie is attempted to be set on the client computer. Neither reference permits a list of unsaved cookies to be generated and then allows a user to select from the list which cookies are to be saved and which of the cookies are to be discarded. Thus, despite the allegations, Doeberl only teaches interpreting each cookie, one at a time, as it reaches the browser, as opposed to presenting a list of unsaved cookies.

Doeberl also does not teach selectively saving a portion of the unsaved cookies, within the list of unsaved cookies, to a permanent data storage. As described above, Doeberl does not teach a list of unsaved cookies. Therefore, Doeberl would not teach selectively saving a portion of the unsaved cookies within a list of unsaved cookies.

Furthermore, it would not have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined teachings of Paltenghe and Doeberl to present a list of cookies, because both Paltenghe and Doeberl specifically teaches away from presenting a list of unsaved cookies and selectively saving cookies within the list of cookies to a permanent data storage. Both references teach to determine whether to save or discard (block) cookies on a one-by-one basis as the cookie is sent to the client machine. Neither reference even suggests to compile a list of unsaved cookies and then present it so that a user may select which cookies are to be saved and which cookies are to be discarded. The present invention provides clear and non-obvious improvements over Paltenghe and Doeberl in that the constant interruptions that are experienced in Paltenghe and Doeberl are eliminated by the present invention. Such an improvement or even desire for such improvement, is not taught, suggested, or even contempted by the cited references.

The Office Action alleges that such modification to Paltenghe and Doeberl would allow the teachings of Paltenghe and Doeberl to "provide information about a user to a website by the internet content provider." It is not clear how

presenting a list of unsaved cookies would "provide information about a user to a website." This seems to be an irrelevant "motivation" that is not supported by the teachings of the references or the knowledge of those of ordinary skill in the art. Providing a list of unsaved cookies would no more provide information about a user to a website than the specific mechanisms actually taught by the references. Thus, despite the Office Action's allegations to the contrary, there is really no motivation to combine the references apart from a prior knowledge of Applicants' claimed invention.

In summary, Paltenghe only teaches a system that presents one cookie to the user at a time in order for the user to accept the cookie and save it to the user's hard drive. Doeberl teaches, as summarized at column 2, lines 42-45 of the reference, a means of interpreting the content of cookies in a cookie file or in RAM mode as it is received at the browser. Neither of the references teaches or suggests the features of presenting a list of unsaved cookies and selectively saving unsaved cookies to a permanent storage. There is also no suggestion in either of the references as to these features. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine or modify the references to reach the presently claimed invention.

In view of the above, neither Paltenghe nor Doeberl, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests presenting a list of unsaved cookies and selectively saving cookies within the list of cookies in response to a user input as to which of the cookies are to be saved, as recited in independent claim 1. Independent claims 9, 15-17, 25 and 31-33 recite similar features to that of claim 1 and thus, distinguish over Paltenghe in view of Doeberl for similar reasons. At least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1, 9, 17 and 25 respectively, neither Paltenghe nor Doeberl, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of dependent claims 3-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 13, 19-20, 22-24, 26, 27 and 29. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13, 15-17, 19-20, 22-27, 29 and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

With regard to independent claims 14 and 30, the Office Action states:

> As per claims 14 and 30, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Paltenghe further discloses "accepting and accumulating cookies without immediately saving the cookies during a session" as the user's PC 4 with the browser 8 which id configured by the user 6 to ask for permission before accepting a cookie, (see col. 7, lines 27-29). Further, in column 8, lines 24-26, Paltenghe discloses if the user 6 accepts the cookie, in which the cookie data is sent by the web server 2 to the browser 8 on the user's PC 4.

Independent claim 14, which is representative of claim 30 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, recites:

> 14. A method for managing cookies in a data processing system, the method comprising:
> accepting and accumulating cookies without immediately saving the cookies during a session;
> presenting a list of the accepted and accumulated cookies;
> receiving a user selection of zero or more cookies from the list of accepted and accumulated cookies; and
> saving the selected cookies, accumulated during the session, to a permanent data storage.
> (emphasis added)

Neither Paltenghe nor Doeberl, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests presenting a list of accepted and accumulated cookies without immediately saving the cookie during a session, receiving a user selection of zero or more cookies from the list of accepted and accumulated cookies, or saving the selected cookies, accumulated during the session, to a permanent data storage, as recited in claims 14 and 30.

The Office Action alleges that Paltenghe teaches these features at column 7, lines 27-29 and column 8, lines 24-26, which reads as follows:

> The prior art interaction between the website server 2 and the user's PC 4 with browser 8 which is configured by the user 6 to ask for permission before accepting a cookie.
> (Column 7, lines 27-29, Paltenghe)

> If the user 6 accepts the cookie, the cookie data is sent by the web server 2 to the browser 8 on the user's PC 4.
> (Column 8, lines 24-26, Paltenghe)

In the above sections, Paltenghe merely teaches presenting a single cookie

to a user for the user to accept the cookie. If the cookie is accepted, the cookie is sent to the browser on the user's PC. However, nowhere in the above section, or any other section, does Paltenghe teach or suggest presenting a list of accepted and accumulated cookies without immediately saving the cookie during a session. Paltenghe only teaches presenting one cookie to the user at a time to be accepted, not a list of cookies that are already accepted and accumulated during a session.

In addition, Paltenghe teaches sending accepted cookies to the user's PC, not saving cookies that are selected from a list of accepted and accumulated cookies. As described above, Paltenghe does not teach a list of accepted and accumulated cookies. Therefore, Paltenghe would not teach receiving a user selection of zero or more cookies from the list of accumulated and accepted cookies. Thus, Paltenghe does not teach the specific features recited in claims 14 and 30.

Doeberl also does not teach presenting a list of accepted and accumulated cookies, receiving a user selection of zero or more cookies from the list of accepted and accumulated cookies without immediately saving the cookie(s), or saving the selected cookies, accumulated during the session, to a permanent data storage. Doeberl only teaches presenting an interpretation of a cookie from either a cookie file or in a RAM mode, depending on the mode of operation, to the user. The cookies in the cookie file are saved cookies, as opposed to cookies that are accepted and accumulated during a session without immediately being saved. The cookies in RAM are presented as they are set in RAM on a one-by-one basis.

With regard to independent claims 34, 35 and 36, the Office Action states:

> As per claims 34, 35 and 36, in addition to the discussion in claims 1 and 9, Paltenghe further discloses, "displaying, in response to a signal to terminate the browser session, a list of cookies temporarily stored during the browser session", (see col. 6, lines 60-62); and
>
> "storing at least one selected cookie in persistent storage in response to user input of a selection from the displayed list" as instead of writing cookies to the hard disk of the user's pc 4 on which the user's browser 8 is installed, the cookies are stored in the user's electronic wallet, (see col. 7, lines 58-61).

Office Action dated November 24, 2003, pages 8-9.

Independent claim 34, which is representative of claims 35 and 36 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, recites:

> 34. A method in a data processing system for managing cookies during a browser session on a client enabled to be communicatively connected to a plurality of servers over a network, the method comprising:
> receiving at least one request to accept at least one cookie during the browser session;
> accepting each of the at least one cookie;
> storing, initially, each of the at least one cookie exclusively in a temporary data store within the data processing system;
> displaying, in response to a signal to terminate the browser session, a list of cookies temporarily stored during the browser session; and
> storing at least one selected cookie in persistent storage in response to user input of a selection from the displayed list.
> (emphasis added)

Neither Paltenghe nor Doeberl teaches or suggests displaying, in response to a signal to terminate the browser session, a list of cookies temporarily stored during the browser session, or storing at least one selected cookie in persistent storage in response to a user input of a selection from the displayed list. The Office Action alleges that Paltenghe teaches these features at column 6, lines 60-62 and column 7, lines 58-61, which reads as follows:

> Currently, cookies are stored in a plain text file on the hard drive of a user's PC, where the browser software is installed.
> (Column 6, lines 60-62, Paltenghe)

> According to the present invention, instead of writing cookies to the hard disk of the user's PC 4 on which the user's browser 8 is installed, the cookies are stored, for example, in the user's electronic wallet 12.
> (Column 7, lines 58-61, Paltenghe)

In the above section, Paltenghe only teaches the prior art that currently exists, which stores a cookie in a cookie file on the user's PC, i.e. in a hardware drive, and an electronic wallet, which is a specialized permanent storage device (see column 6, lines 24-26). However, nowhere in the above sections, or any other section, does Paltenghe teach displaying any list of cookies temporarily stored during a browser session. Since Paltenghe does not teach displaying a list of cookies temporarily stored during a browser session, Paltenghe also does not teach storing at least one selected cookie from the

displayed list. Thus, Paltenghe does not teach the specific features recited in claims 34-36.

Doeberl also does not teach displaying a list of cookies temporarily stored or storing at least one selected cookie from the displayed list in persistent storage. Doeberl only teaches presenting interpretations of each cookie in a cookie file (similar to the permanently stored text file of Paltenghe) or in RAM mode, one at a time, to the user. In addition, Doeberl does not teach anywhere in the reference to store a selected cookie from a displayed list of cookies to a persistent storage. Thus, Doeberl also does not teach the specific features recited in claims 34-36.

In view of the above, neither Paltenghe nor Doeberl, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the specific features of independent claims 14, 30 and 34-36. There is no suggestion or motivation in either of the references to present a list of cookies or storing a selected cookie to a persistent storage. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14, 30 and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over Paltenghe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,729 B1) in view of Doeberl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,237,033 B1) and is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: February 24, 2004

Stephen J. Walder, Jr.
Reg. No. 41,534
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorney for Applicants

SJW/im